

# **KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING**

*October 22-23, 2003*

*Miner's Inn*

*Yreka, California*

## ***FINAL MINUTES***

**October 22, 2003**

### **Membership:**

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry

California Department of Fish and Game

California In-River Sport Fishing Community

Del Norte County

Hoopla Valley Tribe

Humboldt County

Karuk Tribe

Klamath County

Klamath Tribes

National Marine Fisheries Association (NOAA Fisheries)

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Siskiyou County

Trinity County

U.S. Department of Agriculture

U.S. Department of the Interior

Yurok Tribe

Dave Bitts

Neil Manji (alternate)

Vacant

Chuck Blackburn

Robert Franklin (alternate)

Jill Geist

Scott Quinn (alternate)

Steve West, Vice Chair

Not represented

Irma Lagomarsino (alternate)

Keith Wilkinson

Marcia Armstrong

Not represented

Peg Boland

John Engbring, Chair

Dave Hillemeier

### **Agendum 1. Convene and opening remarks**

John Engbring opened the meeting and introduced Steve West from Klamath County as the Vice Chair for this meeting. Marcia Armstrong was introduced as the new designated member for Siskiyou County. John Engbring noted the presence of several alternate members. John made some opening remarks about the collaborative effort in putting together the informational center at the Collier Rest Area off of Interstate 5. He thanked Dave Bitts and the Yurok Tribe for the salmon barbeque at the opening celebration of the information center. Steve West said that he has noticed an improved level of communication among stakeholders in the Upper and Lower Basin and the dialogue seems to be positive. The recent National Sciences Report shows that there is a lot of work to be done by everyone in the Basin. Steve added that he would only be in attendance that day, and not the next.

### **Agendum 2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance**

No congressional staff in attendance.

### **Agendum 3. Business**

#### **a. Adoption of agenda**

Dave Hillemeier requested a status update on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) fish kill report after agendum item 19. Michael Orcutt was noted as not present for his portion of agendum 9, so Robert Franklin will speak to the topic.

**Motion: Keith Wilkinson moved to adopt the agenda, as amended.**

**Second: Jill Geist seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed: unanimously.**

**b. Budget Committee meeting is November 20, 9:00 am, Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office**

John Engbring reported that committee member Joan Smith will be replaced by Marcia Armstrong. Other committee members are Dave Bitts, Michael Orcutt, Neil Manji, Keith Wilkinson and John Engbring. The next agenda includes discussion the upcoming year's budget and a look at the distribution of funds among projects. The meetings are open to all Task Force members.

**Agendum 4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update**

Laurie Simons reviewed the assignments from the last meeting. She reviewed the letters that were sent out since last meeting and the list of 2004 projects (see Agendum 4 handout). The three projects in question at the last meeting are listed and they were funded. Laurie reviewed the meeting handouts and John Engbring reminded the Task Force to review the handouts before the meeting tomorrow.

**Agendum 5. Brief Updates and Announcements**

**a. Update on State coho recovery process**

Craig Martz, the Redding California Department of Fish and Game (Department) Shasta-Scott Recovery Team leader, reported on the status of the coho recovery process. He said that a draft recovery plan was deemed incomplete, so they asked the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) for a time extension to fill in the missing pieces. Both teams have completed their work and the Department is in the process of getting the plan prepared for the Commission. There are public meetings in Santa Rosa and Yreka on November 17 and 20, respectively. We will revise our strategy based on the input of the Commission and the public and will deliver it to the Commission by December 10.

The essential elements in the strategy are: to complete delisting goals; to reach and maintain coho populations that will maintain tribal, recreational and commercial needs; and complete specific watershed recommendations that are characterized in an implementation table using a three tiered approach. John Engbring asked if there are recovery numbers that need to be reached before a species can be de-listed. Craig responded that the knowledge is not there to come up with hard numbers, so the strategy sets up a process and timeframe for achieving the data. The Shasta-Scott document is now on the website.

**b. Update on Shasta-Scott recovery team**

Craig Martz, California Department of Fish and Game (Department), reported that the Shasta-Scott recovery team has shifted their focus from developing recommendations for the strategy to looking at implementation. The recommendations of the team will be put into project management software to understand how they interrelate. This will be a large task. The Department is working with resource conservation districts and the recovery team to flush out conditions of agreement. Dave Hillemeier asked if the Department anticipates developing an interim minimum flow recommendation before the next season and if the process is transparent. Craig answered that interim flows are part of a take permit, so before the Department can issue a permit, they have to go through a transparent environmental process. Dave recommended that the Task Force be involved with flow studies. He also encouraged Basin-wide participation.

**c. Update on NOAA recovery planning process**

Irma Lagomarsino, NOAA Fisheries (NOAA), reported on the NOAA recovery planning process. There has been some progress recently and the next meeting is scheduled for December. In phase one, populations in the coho salmon Ecological Significant Unit (ESU) were preliminarily identified, but that information is not yet public. The second phase includes a viability assessment of each population in order to come up with de-listing criteria. We hope to be finished with phase one by next spring and then we can come up with goals and criteria for the ESU. John Engbring asked if subpopulations were being identified within the ESU and if they could be recovered individually. Irma responded yes, that information will be part of the recovery goals. Dave Hillemeier added that he's not sure that each

individual population needs to be recovered, but they are looking for abundance criteria and spatial distribution criteria to determine if the ESU is viable.

**d. Update on Klamath Fishery Management Council**

Phil Detrich, Designated Federal Official and Department of the Interior representative for the Klamath Fishery Management Council, gave an update on the council's funding. In mid-June, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service heard from Congressman Herger that it was his intent to insert language into the House Appropriations Bill to remove funding for the management council. In the House's version of the bill, the language says there won't be any funds used to support the council. There is not similar language in the Senate bill, so it will have to be resolved in Conference Committee, which has not been scheduled. The council typically has a meeting in October, but it has been cancelled. The council will have to wait to see what the Final Appropriations Bill will say.

The Task Force asked for the rationale behind the language in the bill. Neil Manji reported that the Congressman referred to some letters sent out by the council regarding the allocation of surplus fish. To allocate surplus fish, fisheries in the river must be maintained, which requires the reevaluation of flow studies and habitat. One of the Congressman's basic concerns is that it is the responsibility of the council to discuss allocations and not habitat. Therefore, the council went beyond their task by considering habitat. John Engbring said that the Congressman is sending a clear and strong message that the groups should follow the Klamath Act. Many members of the Task Force voiced their concern regarding the possible disbanding of the council and the negative impacts it would have on the Basin.

**e. Status of Klamath River salmonids**

Neil Manji, California Department of Fish and Game, reported on the status of Klamath River salmonids and referred to the three Agendum 5e handouts. The Department is documenting what's going on in rivers and making estimates. These are the preliminary numbers. The blue handout (see Agendum 5e handout) shows angler harvest in the lower river through October 14. The harvest is relatively high below Clear Creek Falls, and more likely than not, the Department won't have to implement closures. The upper river is showing high harvest numbers as well, allowing for a full fishing season. He noted that information on steelhead is on the back of the handout and numbers are showing catch and release is significantly down. The yellow handout (see Agendum 5e handout) shows spring-run Chinook salmon run-size, spawner escapement, and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Junction City Creek Weir from 1977-2002. The three columns predict numbers and compare years. The Department has to determine cut-off dates. The green handout (see Agendum 5e handout) shows the Junction City and Willow Creek weir trapping summary. Neil reported that video counting is showing that numbers were down this year, but fishing began on July 21. Shasta River numbers are down, but the fish are about a week to ten days behind. There is video counting at Bogus Creek this year and biological sampling of about 500 carcasses. Neil reported that Iron Gate Hatchery numbers will exceed last year's adult count.

Steve West voiced his concern about anonymous documents being submitted to the Task Force. Members of the Task Force agreed to discuss at the next meeting a formal requirement that every handout should have name, date and capacity in which the document is being submitted.

**Motion: Steve West moved for this meeting only, to identify the authors and affiliations of all handouts submitted to the Task Force. This information should be included in the formal record.**

**Second: Marcia Armstrong.**

**Motion passed: unanimously.**

**Assignment: Steve West asked that the Task Force consider as formal policy during the next meeting a requirement that all handouts must include date, authorship, and capacity in which the document is being submitted (affiliation).**

**Agendum 6. The Klamath Watershed in Perspective: A review of historical hydrology of major features of the Klamath River Watershed and evaluation of Hardy Flow requirements**

Dr. Ken Rykbost, the Superintendent of the Klamath Experiment Station at Oregon State University, gave a presentation entitled; “Klamath Watershed in Perspective: A Review of Historical Hydrology of Major Features of the Klamath River Watershed and Evaluation of Hardy Iron Gate Flow Requirements (see Agendum 6 handouts).” Dr. Rykbost reviewed his study objectives; to gain a better understanding of the total Klamath watershed and its hydrologic history, to develop multi-year hydrographs at key locations in the watershed, to look for long-term trends in flows of major tributaries and the Upper Basin, and to examine Klamath Project long-term operations to determine the probability of achieving flow requirements recommended in Hardy Reports. Dr. Rykbost reviewed several hydrographs throughout the river and its tributaries to examine how agriculture would fair if Hardy flows were adopted.

The Klamath Project agricultural water use has not changed significantly in the past half century, and high summer flows requested for environmental use are only potentially available because of storage designated for agricultural irrigation. All tributaries in the Klamath system produce hydrographs with widely varying winter and spring flows but consistently low summer flows. Trinity River diversions represent about 20% of river yield and appear to mainly affect the spring hydrograph for the Trinity River and mouth of the Klamath River. Watershed yield above Upper Klamath Lake appears to have declined in recent decades. Selective use of data can lead to a distorted projection of watershed function and yield. Dr. Rykbost stated that Hardy flow regimes requested for summer months could not be met in a significant number of years even if Klamath Project received no diversions from Upper Klamath Lake or the Klamath River, because use of basin historical flows from 1905-1912 as a baseline results in unachievable expectations.

**Questions:**

A public participant stated that a colleague of Dr. Rykbost’s at Oregon State University (OSU) has studied the increased juniper encroachment over this period of time. Do the evapotranspiration rates in the presentation account for the lower yield in the Upper Basin? Dr. Rykbost replied that he doesn’t believe his colleague has conducted any studies on this. Most people believe that juniper encroachment is a contributor to the lower numbers and there is no doubt that vegetation has changed.

A public participant commented on the increasing wetlands in Upper Klamath Lake. Dr. Rykbost replied that the Nature Conservancy claimed that they were not holding more water than has been held there previously.

Dave Bitts asked why flows in the basin were compared to flows at the mouth of the river. Dr. Rykbost replied that he wasn’t using the information to look at the fishery; he used it to determine quantities of water produced in different parts of the basin.

Keith Wilkinson asked what the political perspective was when the first diversion was made from the Pit River drainage. Dr. Rykbost replied that the diversion was made from Tule Lake for agriculture and politics were different then.

Dave Hillemeier said that Hardy Phase 2 flows are not based on the hydrograph from 1905-1912 and that needs to be corrected if your presentation is made public. He expressed concern that this misinformation can be divisive. He added that scientists are currently in support of Hardy Phase 2. Dave pointed out that it is misleading to only look at flows on an annual basis. It is important to look at flows during the critical times of the year such as August. Dr. Rykbost is focusing on flows at the mouth and the important habitat is further upstream. Therefore, flows at Iron Gate Dam should be analyzed. He would recommend that a hydrologist at OSU look into this. Dr. Rykbost replied that any point can be made by looking at any given year. He tried to look at the big picture.

Irma Lagomarsino asked what the future holds for this presentation. Dr. Rykbost replied that he doesn’t plan on publishing the work and that it has not been peer reviewed.

**Agendum 7. Public Comment**

Mike Belchik, Yurok Fisheries Program, commented that the Yurok Tribe asked him to review Dr. Rykbost's presentation and give a short analysis. In the process of writing this review to present in public, he felt it was not a good way to further the understanding of scientific issues in the Basin. There are many technical forums and the report is still in draft. Dialogue can happen in a more constructive way than dueling power point presentations. It is with regret that this is not a constructive method for critiquing, but the Yurok Tribe felt compelled to correct some of the information presented by Dr. Rykbost (see Agendum 6 handout). He noted that the Yurok Tribe hopes information sharing can be done in a more constructive manner in the future.

Glen Spain, Pacific Coast Federation Fisherman's Association, commented that while it is true that the Klamath Project grew in 1960, irrigated agriculture has extended outside of this project and that is probably a contributor to lower lake levels. He urged Dr. Rykbost to consider this. He noted that there are continuing impacts and that summer flows and percentages of total flows at various parts of the river coming from Iron Gate Dam have been below the average over the past 50 years and this can be misleading. Steve West commented that Dr. Rykbost has made a serious indictment on Oregon Department of Water Resources (ODWR) that they have over appropriated water. This accusation of over appropriation should be addressed. He suggested that the Task Force invite ODWR to the next meeting.

**Assignment: Staff will invite Oregon Department of Water Resources to the February Task Force meeting to address concerns regarding water appropriation.**

Marty Macy, Tule Lake Growers Association, noted that in 2001, the Klamath Project got zero water. We are compelled to do something to correct that so it doesn't happen again. She wanted to point out that the agricultural community has been at the forefront of restoration programs and with the refuges. It is not true that expanding agriculture uses more water; we are at the forefront of technology concerning water use. We do not make an effort to use more water, we try to be economical. We are all involved and aware of what's going on in our community.

Doug Whitsett, Water for Life, stated that a study was conducted on the Sprague River that plotted irrigation acreage against climatic conditions over time. The study determined that flow in the river increased in August and September. There was consumptive use over June and July, but some of the water stored in the soil was returned to the river. The study shows that irrigation has expanded and there is more flow in the Sprague River in August and September. He noted that the study was conducted by U.S. Geological Survey.

Felice Pace, Klamath Forest Alliance (KFA), noted that Dr. Rykbost's presentation helps the debate. He agrees that not enough attention was given to other players in the Basin. There is a difference between impaired and unimpaired flows and the basis for Dr. Rykbost's presentation was impaired flows. He found it interesting that he did not present empirical data to show the rise in water use and encouraged Dr. Rykbost to use empirical data. He noted that the forests were managed for clear cuts, which initially leads to more water in the river, but eventually decreases water in the river as vegetation grows. The other factor is soil compaction from roads and the effects on the soil as a reservoir. The refuge water is supplied by agriculture and comes from wells in California that has been paid for at market rates. If refuges could use winter spill water this well water would not be needed.

Felice Pace commented that he is impressed with the Department's fishery management in the Lower Basin. He noted that fluctuations between years mean that one of the cohorts is impacted and that is a sign that a species is at risk. He gave KFA's recommendations on the State coho recovery plan (see Agendum 7 handout). There is concern that users are negotiating incidental take permits with the recovery team. It is Department's responsibility to do this. He noted that there is take information available on the Scott and Shasta rivers. He noted that Siskiyou County has refused to address ground water issues and now there is a train wreck on the Shasta and Scott because Department is making deals

that don't address the key issues and under those circumstances the commission will be acting illegally. He noted that faith in this state process is currently low.

#### **Agendum 8. Status of Klamath Project Long-term Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and continuing operations**

Christine Karas, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), reported that the EIS comment period has been extended to December 15. Reclamation will be identifying issues, potential impacts, and alternatives to be considered. The alternative formulation process will begin after the comment period. Reclamation is preparing an unimpaired flow study that could potentially serve Hardy Phase 2. Part A and B summary reports on Upper Klamath Lake and Lower Klamath Lake will be out by the end of October. The summary reports are under internal peer review and include a hydrology manual with all data and methods. It will be available for public review before it is finalized.

Christine Karas thanked everyone who provided comments on the Conservation Implementation Plan (CIP). Significant changes are being made and a draft is scheduled to come out in October. Reclamation hopes to help unify the Basin through improved communication. She noted that Reclamation would like to develop a standardized water quality monitoring program. The next CIP document is another draft with facilitated public meetings following throughout the Basin. There will be an open meeting in January to discuss water banking; what's been learned, what worked and what the Bureau is planning for the future.

John Engbring asked how the Biological Opinion affects the water bank and the CIP. Christine Karas replied that the judge ruled that the incidental take statement needed to be refined and there needed to be clarification on how other sources of needed water would be obtained. She doesn't believe the Biological Opinion will impact water banking and the CIP at this time. Irma Lagomarsino added that the judge focused on two aspects of the opinion and felt no certainty was demonstrated in the proposal. The solution is being worked on, but the judge did not institute any deadlines. NOAA Fisheries would like to have a new statement prepared by the next irrigation season. John asked if NOAA Fisheries is focusing on those two areas. Irma replied yes, but that it would not require a new effects analysis. However, that doesn't mean there isn't going to be a re-initiation due to Hardy Phase 2 and the National Research Council report. It could change what the Reasonable and Prudent Alternative would look like.

Robert Franklin asked Christine Karas if Argonne National Laboratory is aware that the unimpaired flow study results will be used to inform Hardy Phase 2. He noted that this might impact the final product delivered to Reclamation. He added that the tribes have expressed interest in informing unimpaired flow study techniques. Christine Karas replied that Argonne National Laboratory's scope of work has not yet been developed. She added that Robert's point is well taken and that the goal was for Argonne to review methodologies and calculations and look for flaws. Dave Hillemeier added that it is important that there be a collaborative effort to review data and methods of an unimpaired hydrology study. Christine responded that the process is open and transparent and the opportunity for review will be present.

#### **Agendum 9. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group**

Dave Hillemeier deferred the Klamath Watershed Coordination Group report to Alice Kilham. Alice noted that the Klamathgroup.org website is not very up to date. Some groups do a good job of updating their sites, but others need help. She recommended that the coordination group hire a webmaster to help update the website to help people better understand how much is at stake in this Basin and how much effort is going into the Basin. Some agency representatives reported on various website improvements being made. Alice asked for the Task Force support to go forward with requesting for money from the agencies for a part-time webmaster. The Task Force approved of the coordination group's search for a part-time webmaster.

#### **Klamath Basin Compact Commission**

Alice Kilham, Klamath Basin Compact Commission, reported that the Klamath Basin Compact Commission usually meets one time per year, but has not met in some time.

**Upper Klamath Basin Working Group**

Jim Carpenter, Upper Klamath Basin Working Group, reported that the 5<sup>th</sup> annual Klamath Watershed Conference will take place February 24-26, 2004, in Klamath Falls and is entitled; "Communities, Resources and Restoration." Jim noted that Lower Basin participation is needed in the conference as well as other workshop ideas, and funding. Website: <http://extension.oregonstate.edu/Klamath>.

Jim reported that the Hatfield Group finally received funding to do a two year watershed assessment. The Request for Proposals went out and David Evans & Associates was selected to conduct the assessment. A website that gives a bi-weekly report on Klamath Basin Ecosystem Foundation is up and running. Jim reported that he recognized several key recommendations from the National Academy of Sciences Report. He noted that everyone should feel privileged to work in this Basin.

**Trinity Management Council (on Thursday)**

Robert Franklin, Hoopa Valley Tribe, gave an update on the Trinity Management Council. He reported that Westlands Irrigation District in the San Joaquin Valley has a lawsuit against the United States and the Hoopa Valley Tribe has joined with the United States and State of California. The Irrigation District has historically had issues with Federal agencies and they are looking for a global settlement and combination of claim. The regional Bureau of Reclamation office and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service were looking to work with Westlands to determine if a settlement could occur. The agencies encouraged the tribe to listen to Westlands because flow allocations that would hold up in court could be achieved. Westland's settlement proposal was delivered two hours before the meeting with the tribe and indicated no difference from the Trinity River evaluation study through the record of decision. The tribe and agencies rejected Westland's proposal and the tribe is promoting Federal legislation to declare that National Environmental Policy Act requirements need to be sufficiently addressed.

**Agendum 10. Report from Technical Work Group**

Petey Brucker, Chair of the Technical Work Group, reported that the Technical Work Group drafted comments on the Bureau of Reclamation's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping document (see Agendum 10 handout). He noted that the comments were pulled together quickly because there are about fifty days left in the commenting period. Petey Brucker asked the Task Force to provide comments on the draft letter within the next three weeks. He volunteered to edit the comment letter based on Task Force comments and to work with Laurie Simons to produce a final comment letter.

**Assignment: Task Force members will provide comments to staff within two weeks regarding Technical Work Group comment letter on the Bureau of Reclamation's EIS scoping document. Staff will work with Petey to incorporate Task Force feedback into the comment letter for submission to the Bureau of Reclamation by December 15, 2003.**

**Staff will distribute an electronic version of the Technical Work Group EIS comments to Task Force members.**

Petey Brucker reported on the Spring Chinook Recovery Work Group. He noted that 12 life history stages have been identified and they have drafted strategies for nine of them. The work group will be looking for feedback when they complete the write ups for each life stage. He would like to incorporate this information into the Salmon River Sub-Basin Strategy (see Agendum 10 handout).

Petey Brucker reported on the Klamath River Fish Coordination Group. He stated that the group is working to figure out how to use extra water to prevent a fish kill by identifying triggers and examining disease. Dave Bitts asked if an early response fish kill monitoring mechanism is in place. Petey responded that there is a mechanism in place for fall Chinook on the Trinity River. Robert Franklin added that it is a one time program for this year. There is hope for something more in the future. Dave Bitts asked what it would take to have a similar plan implemented for future years subject to water availability. John Engbring replied that it takes a coordination effort between tribes, state, and parties that are actively monitoring the river. The plan is there and will be used in future years with modification

depending on water year. The group discussed the need for a collaborative effort in developing solutions. Petey Brucker added that the coordination group is working with California Department of Fish and Game (Department) to provide recommendations and proposals on the Klamath River.

Petey said that he reported on the coordination of water quality monitoring on the mainstem at the last meeting. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service feels there is a need for better coordination and thus is working with Texas University and U.C. Santa Cruz on water quality monitoring in the Basin. Robert Franklin stated that water quality and flow issues are intertwined and asked if the Technical Work Group interacts with Tom Hardy or Tom Shaw. Petey Brucker replied that there is a lot of overlap between the groups and therefore information is exchanged, but there always remains the need for better coordination. Petey stated that the Technical Work Group is working to put out an accomplishments report and a list of priorities that include: development of a consistent tracking system in sub-basins, paying more attention to work group involvement in sub-basin processes, and looking in greater detail at the hatcheries.

John added that new Technical Work Group members include John Menke, Siskiyou County and Robert Franklin, Hoopa Valley Tribe.

#### **Agendum 11. Presentation of Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Awards**

John Engbring, Department of the Interior, presented the 7<sup>th</sup> annual Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Awards, to be given in recognition of work by non-agency individuals and groups that contributed significantly to anadromous fishery restoration on the Klamath River. They are given in honor of Nathaniel Bingham, who was deeply involved in fishery issues and was an integral force in the Klamath Fishery Management Council. This year, the individual award goes to Jim Beck. Jim was nominated for his uncommon enthusiasm in working with several agencies and groups to conduct work on his property in Grenada. He has been a very active participant in what has truly been a very successful collaborative project. He had the initiative to begin this process on his own and the determination to see it through. Jim has proven himself to be a true steward of the land, and it has been our good fortune to work with him.

The group award goes to Will Harling and the Orleans/ Somes Bar Fire Safe Council. They were nominated for their work in organizing volunteer workdays and securing several grants for fuels reduction in the Middle Klamath Sub-basin. In just two years, they have organized themselves, formed a board, hired crews, and conducted work in several high risk areas, all while working on a shoe-string budget. They have successfully maneuvered through the maze of agreement management, compliance pitfalls, and implementation setbacks, and should prove to be a strong partner in the Middle Klamath. Jim Henderson of the Mid-Klamath Watershed Council accepted the award for Will Harling and the Fire Safe Council.

A Certificate of Appreciation goes to Peter Brucker. Peter has made significant contributions to the restoration of anadromous fish in the Salmon River as Director of the Salmon River Restoration Council and in the Klamath River as a member and the Chair of the Technical Work Group. He has also contributed a great deal of personal time to broaden the awareness and increase commitment of the Salmon River community, promote cooperative relationships between lawful land and water resource users of the Salmon River sub-basin, and has created partnerships between private landowners and government agencies to improve habitat for a variety of fish and wildlife.

#### **Agendum 12. Presentation of Shasta Agricultural Runoff Capture and Wildlife Habitat Project**

Jim Beck, Landowner, gave a presentation on an agricultural runoff capture and wildlife habitat project he implemented on his land (see Agendum 12 handout). Jim noted that he had a problem with runoff water from adjacent properties running into his land, which is adjacent to the Shasta River. Project designers figured the runoff water could be used for irrigation. Instead of going directly into the river, a reservoir was built for the irrigation water and seepage from the reservoir went into the soil and finally into the Shasta River about 200 feet below the reservoir. Jim stated that if nothing had been done with this runoff, California Department of Fish and Game would have labeled him a point source polluter. He noted that

everyone profited from the project and this year, the Shasta River is significantly cleaner. Jim thanked all of the people who helped design the project.

Jim Carpenter asked how the runoff water is utilized. Jim Beck replied that the next step in the project is to return it uphill to use it again. Jim DePree, Siskiyou County, asked if there is a provision to monitor what's coming in to the reservoir and what's seeping through to the river. Jim Beck replied that it is in the works, but is a challenge. Marcia Armstrong asked Jim if he took advantage of the water quality plans provided by National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and the extension. Jim Beck replied no, but NRCS helped us to measure water quality. Marcia wanted to make sure people were aware of their program.

#### **Thursday, October 23<sup>rd</sup>**

John Engbring reconvened the meeting and noted several changes in membership representation; Ron Reed represented the Karuk Tribe, Robbie VandeWater, represented the Department of Agriculture, and Steve West and Neil Manji were not in attendance.

#### **Agendum 14. Task Force review of recommendations from Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee**

Ronnie Pierce, Klamath River Inter-Tribal Fish and Water Commission, led the Task Force review of recommendations from the Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee. Ronnie referenced two handouts during the discussion (see Agendum 14 handouts). The handout entitled "Klamath Task Force Subcommittee Recommendation on Mid-Term Review, Revision of the Long range Plan Review of Actions Taken Prior to October 11, 2002" will be called the "review" for purposes of discussion. The second handout will be called "excerpts." Ronnie stated that the Long Range Plan was written from 1987-1991 as an adaptive management plan and in the plan exists a clause that it be reviewed and revised as necessary every five years. The Task Force hired Kier & Associates to conduct a mid-term review of the restoration plan. They have recommended removing tasks from the old plan and the Task Force did not want to take those recommendations until a subcommittee was assigned to review the recommendations. The subcommittee compared Kier & Associates mid-term evaluation with the Long Range Plan and developed a list of recommendations that the Task Force needs to provide direction on today. John Engbring added that today the Task Force will look at various recommendations and give them a thumbs up or thumbs down and at the end of the day there will be a motion made to accept the changes made to the Long Range Plan.

Ronnie reported that Kier & Associates recommended removing items 2.F.1 and 2.F.3 shown in the excerpts regarding the Scott and Shasta River improvement of instream flow conditions for salmonids and seeking enforcement. Keith Wilkinson reported that Department of Water Resources (DWR) has already implemented strict regulations and is currently working under this policy.

Marcia Armstrong stated that she is concerned that 2.F.1 recommendations are unlawful and inappropriate regarding water delivery and water rights. Ronnie Pierce suggested adding language to make the action site specific. Robert Franklin added that he understands Marcia's concern, but he doesn't want to wordsmith a plan that was written and edited 15 years ago. John clarified that the Task Force's task is to discuss what to do with these recommendations, so there exists an opportunity to review options and make changes. He added that the subcommittee has recommended these actions remain in the plan with modified language.

Recovery teams are currently dealing with some of these issues. The Task Force discussed language modifications to 2.F.1 and its sub-bullets and made the following changes:

## 2.F.1 changes:

- a. add “where appropriate” after practices, and delete “in unlined ditches”
- b. delete 1, 2, 3,
- c. delete the first sentence through “then” and capitalize “support.”

Ronnie reported that section 2.F.3 calls for action to be taken by 1995 and no action has been taken. Peg Boland reported that U.S. Forest Service (USFS) has low priority in legally enforcing minimum fish flows required in the Scott River adjudication. The Task Force discussed the legal wording in 2.F.3 and the rights of involved parties. Task Force members suggested wording to replace the legal implications with encouragement of action. The group agreed that language needed to be broad. Ronnie reminded the group that 15 years ago, certain issues were controversial and thus a unique set of language was developed for the Long Range Plan.

Ronnie called attention to the due dates of the actions and asked if they should be modified to reflect reality. The Task Force discussed this and decided to keep the dates in place in order to reflect goals that were set and not met by the due dates.

John asked the Task Force to reconsider language for 2.F.3. Bill Bennett, DWR, Ronnie Pierce, and John Engbring suggested language changes and the Task Force discussed the suggestions. The groups focused on making changes that broadened uses of water from focusing only on agricultural uses. Task Force members voiced their concern on making changes to the Long Range Plan without having more time to consider the changes. Other Task Force members believe that making changes updates the plan and if language can not be agreed to today, it should remain in the plan as currently written.

The group moved on to other recommendations but returned to section 2.F.3 after lunch and agreed to the following edits:

## 2.F.3 change so that it reads as below:

- a. Encourage verification of compliance with water rights under the Scott River adjudication.
- b. Encourage action by the U.S. Forest Service to enable it to achieve adequate instream fish flows for fish.
- c. Encourage the State Water Resources Control Board to enforce the water rights laws pertaining to the wasteful use of water by agricultural and other uses.

The group decided to discuss 2.F.4 at the next Task Force meeting.

**Assignment: Staff will include recommendation 2.F.4 of the Long Range Plan on the February Task Force meeting agenda for discussion.**

Ronnie read Kier & Associates recommendation on HR 1, which stated that there is such a widespread problem with anadromous salmonids stock groups that using these criteria for project selection is no longer feasible. The group discussed the recommendation and decided to leave the language in because it helps prioritize species and projects.

Ronnie reported that Kier & Associates recommends removing section FPP 3 in regards to fish population and protection because no action has been taken by the Task Force. The group agreed that the action should be removed because the Task Force does not deal in the law enforcement arena.

Ronnie reported that when the Task Force was first working on the Long Range Plan, mining was an issue. It became a non-issue in the 1990's, but suction dredging has recently become an issue again. Kier & Associates recommends that the Task Force remove M1-M5. Ronnie suggested keeping the mining section in the plan because of the resurrection of the issue. She asked that the Task Force provide a forum on the subject. She said that suction dredge mining is a big recreation opportunity. California Department of Fish and Game permits it and USFS allows it based on permits. Peg Boland reported that

U.S. Forest Service is looking into the recent increase in section dredging as is the Army Corps of Engineers, NOAA Fisheries, and the Shasta Water Regional Control Board. There are legal implications as to who has certain responsibilities, but there might be a common resolution to be shared. John stated that the Task Force has recommended leaving the mining recommendations in place until we hear an informational update on the status of suction dredging in the Basin from knowledgeable parties at the next Task Force meeting.

**Assignment: Staff will organize a presentation for the February Task Force meeting on suction dredge mining issues affecting anadromous fish, regulatory controls on it, and methods for addressing cumulative effects. Presenters could include representatives from California Department of Fish and Game, Forest Service, NOAA Fisheries, dredge miners, and Petey Brucker.**

The Task Force agreed to remove SD-5 through E-10 in the mining section on page 7 of the agendum 14 handout. Members noted that changes made to the Long Range Plan today will be recognized by members of the public who follow the actions of the Task Force.

Ronnie read the final recommendation from Kier & Associates to change the formatting of the Long Range Plan with a new coding system. She suggested that the Task Force work to get the plan up to speed and sent to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as a comprehensive plan. Laurie Simons added that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service looked at Kier & Associates formatting suggestions and determined that it would take a lot of work to implement. Actions taken by the Task Force are being monitored in a simple, effective way. The group discussed the most effective way to organize the plan and decided to have Laurie Simons work with Ronnie Pierce, the Mid-term Evaluation Committee, and the Budget Committee to update the current Long Range Plan. The group also agreed to not take the recommendation from Kier & Associates to restructure the plan with a new coding system.

**Assignment: Staff will work with Ronnie Pierce to identify the work it will take to update the Long-Range Plan according to Task Force decisions. Staff will coordinate with the Mid-Term Evaluation Sub-committee regarding any questions and send an email to the Task Force describing how we will move forward on this before the February meeting.**

**Motion: Keith Wilkinson moved to adopt the revisions made to the Long-Range Plan shown in Agendum 14 handout and agreed to in this meeting, with the sole exclusion of section 2.F.4. The Task Force will not adopt the Long-Range plan structure recommended by Kier & Associates.**

**Second: Chuck Blackburn.**

**Motion passed: unanimously.**

Peg Boland reported that Robbie VandeWater, U.S. Forest Service will be sitting in on the meeting for her this afternoon. She added that the National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) is currently conducting outreach for five positions in Yreka to work on Klamath Basin issues. She recommended the Task Force invite an NRCS representative to the next meeting to give an update on the outreach.

**Assignment: Staff will invite NRCS to the February Task Force meeting to give an update on their expanding program, covering both the Upper Basin and Lower Basin activities.**

#### **Agendum 15. Public Comment**

Petey Brucker, Chair of the Technical Work Group, stated that he would be willing to present information on suction dredging at the next Task Force meeting. He added that the Technical Work Group is working closely with the State Water Regional Control Board on the monitoring program he talked about yesterday.

Christine Karas, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, recommended that the Task Force include notes on achieved actions in the redraft of the Long Range Plan.

**Agendum 16. Update on relicensing of PacifiCorp's Klamath Hydroelectric Project**

John Mudre, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), gave a presentation on the overall FERC relicensing process (see agendum 16 handout). He stated that FERC's goal is to balance resources involved in the relicensing. PacifiCorp is using a traditional licensing process, which includes three stages ending in the final license application submittal to FERC. There is opportunity for public involvement. Ronnie Pierce asked if FERC waits to accept the final license application until after the public commenting period. John replied no, FERC simply makes sure that the application is complete. He continued that there is agency involvement in the process and statutory requirements, several of which are mandatory conditions. FERC's Environmental Impact Statement preparation begins when it is determined that there is enough information to inform a licensing decision. FERC issues a Ready for Environmental Analysis (REA) notice and amendments can be made by PacifiCorp up until 30 days after the REA is issued. FERC will give notice of this and ask for public comment. 10(j) recommendations allow for protection of fisheries and they are incorporated into the license unless the recommendations are inconsistent with the Federal Power Act or the law. The 4(e) preliminary recommendations are mandatory and should be submitted to FERC before the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is out to the public.

Licenses include adaptive management conditions and often result in settlement agreements. They can be amended or reopened. The group asked about filing a request to reopen the license and how FERC deals with that. John replied that FERC asks the licensee to respond to the request and then FERC makes the decision if it should be reopened or reinitiated. He noted that the FERC website is a good place to find information on relicensing (<http://www.ferc.gov>). Robert Franklin asked about the relationship between FERC and Tribes. John replied that FERC has a tribal liaison officer.

Todd Olson, project manager for PacifiCorp's FERC project 2082, gave a presentation on where the relicensing process is to date. The hydro facilities generate about 150 megawatts of power with the major facility, J.C. Boyle, being used for peaking during peak hours. Most of PacifiCorp's studies are focused in the J.C. Boyle reach, but some studies, such as water quality modeling, extend to the mouth of the river. This past year the collaborative, consisting of many key players in the Basin, has focused on approving study plans. Study information is currently coming in and a few studies will occur post filing. There are 48 study plans and only eight have not been approved. Some work has been conducted on the unapproved study plans with work group approval, but this doesn't mean there aren't disagreements. Robert Franklin asked if dam removal has been part of the discussion. Todd replied that there are three components to that; 1) PacifiCorp is looking at traditional fish passage planning with engineers, 2) PacifiCorp is looking at the future role of the Iron Gate Hatchery, and 3) PacifiCorp is using models to look at fish production numbers if passage was not an issue. The models are running dam out scenarios. He noted that the models are being populated with information from above Upper Klamath Lake and will be run under different scenarios. Todd continued that studies are being conducted in various resource areas including: water quality, aquatics, recreation resources, terrestrial resources, cultural resources, and socioeconomics. There are issues within each of these resource areas that the work groups have been unable to come to agreement on, thus issue papers have been developed for the plenary to provide next steps. The work groups are working to complete studies and fill in the Systems Landscape Options Matrix (high level look at scenarios). PacifiCorp will be holding Joint Agency meetings in November to share PM&Es for the new license and to discuss disagreements on study results and the proposed project. More information is available at: <http://www.pacificorp.com>.

Bill Bennett, Department of Water Resources (DWR), asked how 401 certification fits into the FERC process. Todd replied that PacifiCorp needs to show FERC that a 401 certification application has been submitted before the final license application is submitted. John Mudre added that FERC cannot issue a license without a 401 certification. The conditions of the certificate are mandatory. Dave Hillemeier asked what happens if the license isn't issued by 2006. John replied that an annual license is issued under the original license terms. John Engbring asked about section 10(a) of the Federal Power Act and how

FERC considers the Task Force's Long Range Plan. John Mudre stated that FERC must consider how the license will be consistent with comprehensive plans.

**Agendum 17. Should the Technical Work Group be assigned to draft a list of 20 high priority projects similar to the 1086 plan for the Sacramento basin?**

Dave Bitts, California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry, gave the background for the agendum item (see Agendum 17 handout). He stated that the concept is to do a needs assessment for the Basin using the 1086 program in the Sacramento Basin as a model because they've accomplished the entire program. Dave suggested that the Task Force have a ranked list of top priority needs that could be funded by a variety of sources. There is a lot of work that has already been done that could inform this list. The group discussed the pros and cons of a prioritized list of projects. Some members voiced the value in having a planning document for others to use if the Task Force ceases to exist. The first step is for the Technical Work Group to identify different processes throughout the Basin and who is working on them, first focusing on the Lower Basin. The Task Force agreed that the Technical Work Group will work to develop a list of projects focusing on anadromous fish restoration, cost estimates of each project, and who could be responsible for funding them. The Technical Work Group will bring the list to the next meeting for the Task Force to review.

**Assignment: Technical Work Group is assigned to produce a prioritized list of key projects that could be implemented in the near future to benefit anadromous fish of the basin. The document will include cost estimates and potential partners to help with implementation. The Task Force will discuss the list during the February meeting for determination of next steps.**

**Agendum 18. Public Comment**

Felice Pace, Klamath Forest Alliance, stated that he has been involved with the PacifiCorp relicensing process for a long time. Klamath Forest Alliance believes that the collaborative has worked well together and PacifiCorp has supported the group, but there is an area of concern regarding the failure to tell the real story of the history of the Klamath River basin. Felice shared an excerpt from Klamath Forest Alliances Draft License Application comments (see Agendum 18 handout).

**Agendum 19. Report from Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office on Flow Study results**

George Guillen, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), reported that the Task Force identified the need for a flow study to provide necessary information for restoration. This is the third year of the study with most of the work being conducted below Iron Gate Dam. The majority of projects focus on water quality, habitat and fishery relationships with flow. During the last year, the analysis focused on trout as well as the 2002 fish die off. The study matrix developed by the Technical Work Group was used as a starting point for project selection and the final selection focuses on attainable goals. Dave Hillemeier added that it is worth noting that everything in this process has been cooperative.

Out migrant trapping was conducted for the third year because the Klamath is an index river. Meso-habitat mapping was done on the Scott River in order to begin HSC mapping. A similar effort was made in the Shasta River as well. Gauging work was done in Scott River in coordination with Department of Water Resources. Water quality monitoring was done below Iron Gate Dam in the Klamath River in cooperation with U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). Vertical profiles in the mid and lower river don't seem to show strong stratification. Grab samples collected didn't show any ammonia problems.

Flow data will be compiled into a report for distribution to the tribes before it is made public. The main thing to note is the difference between 2002 and 2003 flows.

There was a wide variation of Dissolved Oxygen (DO) levels below Iron Gate Dam at the bridge. DO levels at Seiad have been low in the past years and there is improvement in DO near Orleans and less variation during the day. The Trinity River generally has cooler water but peaks in the summer with a drop in late August due to the pulse flow. DO levels were good. The pulse flow was measured at various

places and three temperature gauges showed a drop in temperature and air as the flow came through, showing the influence on meteorological effects on water. There is a definite influence on the Klamath River from the Trinity River about five miles below the confluence.

In summary, water temperatures were fairly warm in 2003 with less stratification in the pools. There might be some ground water recharge in some areas causing a lower DO. Marcia Armstrong asked if DO studies were conducted along the river. George replied no, that was done last year and there wasn't much variation. This year we were awarded with a water quality assessment contract for the Klamath Basin and our goal was to assist resource agencies in determining future recommendations for the river. We want to work with the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) process, but will be focusing on the entire watershed where the TMDL process focuses on a particular basin. Dr. Neil Armstrong from the University of Texas was selected for the three to four year project. The fish die-off made for some unexpected water quality monitoring activity. A draft report is currently being reviewed by the Washington D.C. office. Fish disease studies were conducted with the Yurok Tribe in the lower river and we didn't see a lot of disease. USGS is working on developing SIAM and SALMOD and hope to be finished with this process by spring 2004.

George reported that funding is at the same level as in the past. The Task Force recommended \$22 million over five years, but the flow study funding is well below that. A lot of the studies are difficult and we try to prioritize, but there's not that much hope for additional funding. We will continue to work cooperatively throughout the Basin. Felice Pace asked if the Shasta-Scott instream flow study is needed. George replied that it is a need and will take a lot of cooperation. Ron Reed added that even though the Karuk Tribe did not get funded for the disease study, we contributed a lot of information to Dr. Foott's study.

George noted that there are a lot of different things going on in the Klamath Basin and a lot of people are stretched thin, which is a challenge. He thinks there are great opportunities for collaboration. Ronnie Pierce agreed about the opportunities to collaborate to date until the positive factors to the fish die off report was put together. John Engbring stated that the report was sent out for internal peer review within USFWS and comments were incorporated. It was sent to Washington D.C. two weeks ago and they don't seem to have too many comments. It should be ready for public review soon. Many group members shared their concern regarding this report; stating their unease with the review process and contents of the report.

#### **Agendum 20. Public Comment**

Christine Karas, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, stated that there is value to the Task Force submitting comments to the Environmental Impact Statement. If the deadline can not be reached, please consider sending individual comments in lieu of Task Force comments.

Felice Pace, Klamath Forest Alliance (KFA), made suggestions for the next Task Force meeting agenda. He suggested: hearing an update from the Klamath Federal Working Group on specific proposals being discussed, updates on the Total Maximum Daily Load processes, Shasta-Scott Recovery Plan presentation, and an update from California Department of Fish and Game on the fish regulations. Felice stated that KFA will make comments on limiting impacts on spring chinook. We have a major expenditure of money by the National Resource Conservation Service. He suggested the Task Force hear an update on that process. He'll make any information available to staff.

Marcia Armstrong suggested a presentation on the Scott River Strategic Action Plan for the next meeting.

#### **Agendum 21. Recap and Summary of Assignments and Motions**

Next meetings are: February 18-19, 2004 in Brookings; June 23-24, 2004 in Klamath Falls; and October 13-14, 2004 in Yreka.

The meeting was adjourned.

***FINAL AGENDA***

**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING**

***October 22-23, 2003***

***Miner's Inn***

***Yreka, California***

**October 22, 2003**

- 9:00 AM      1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, Chair, and Steve West, Vice Chair. Vice Chair for next meeting is Steve West.
- 9:15            2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance
- 9:30            3. Business
- a. Adoption of agenda
- b. Budget Committee meeting is November 20, 9:00 am, Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office
- 9:45            4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Laurie Simons)
- 10:00          5. Brief Updates and Announcements
- a. Update on State coho recovery process (Neil Manji)
- b. Update on Shasta-Scott recovery team (Phil Detrich)
- c. Update on NOAA recovery planning process (Irma Lagomarsino)
- d. Update on Klamath Fishery Management Council (Phil Detrich)
- e. Status of Klamath River salmonids (Neil Manji)
- 10:30          6. The Klamath Watershed in Perspective: A review of historical hydrology of major features of the Klamath River Watershed and evaluation of Hardy Flow requirements (Dr. Ken Rykbost, Oregon State University)
- 11:30          7. Public Comment
- 11:45          Lunch
- 1:00            8. Status of Klamath Project Long-term EIS and continuing operations (Christine Karas, Bureau of Reclamation)
- 1:45            9. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group (Dave Hillemeier)
- Klamath Basin Compact Commission (Alice Kilham)
- Trinity Management Council (Mike Orcutt)
- Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Jim Carpenter)
- 2:15            10. Report from Technical Work Group (Petey Brucker)
- 3:00            Break
- 3:20            11. Presentation of Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Awards (John Engbring)

3:45 12. Presentation of Shasta Agricultural Runoff Capture and Wildlife Habitat Project (Jim Beck, Landowner and Superintendent, Yreka Union High School District; Mark Elfgen, CDFG; Dave Webb, Shasta CRMP; Gary Curtis, FWS)

4:15 13. Public Comment

4:30 **Recess**

5:00 - 6:00 PM Field Trip to visit the Shasta Agricultural Runoff Capture and Wildlife Habitat Project in the Shasta Valley with Jim Beck, Mark Elfgen, and Dave Webb.

7:00 – 9:00 PM Social Hour at Casa Ramos in Yreka. Have drinks and/or dinner with us.

**Reconvene - October 23, 2003**

8:00 AM 14. Task Force review of recommendations from Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee (Ronnie Pierce)

11:30 15. Public Comment

11:45 Lunch

1:00 16. Update on relicensing of PacifiCorp's Klamath Hydroelectric Project (Todd Olson, PacifiCorp and John Mudre, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission)

2:00 17. Should the Technical Work Group be assigned to draft a list of 20 high priority projects similar to the 1086 plan for the Sacramento basin? (Dave Bitts)

2:30 18. Public Comment

2:45 Break

3:00 19. Report from Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office on Flow Study results (George Guillen and Tom Shaw, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office)

4:45 20. Public Comment

4:00 21. Recap and Summary of Assignments and Motions (John Engbring)  
Next meetings are: February 18-19, 2004 in Brookings; June 23-24, 2004 in Klamath Falls; and October 13-14, 2004 in Yreka.

4:10 PM Adjourn

**After meeting excursions:** Stop by one of the places below to see what is happening with salmon. Please sign up with Laurie or Darla if you plan to go by 3:00.

5:00 – 6:30 Collier Interpretive and Information Center at Collier Rest Area (11 miles north of Yreka on I-5) is planning salmon restoration interpretive displays. Come visit to see the plans and listen to an explanation with Don Humphries and Bob Rice.

5:00 – 6:30      Salmon are running to Iron Gate Hatchery and the adjacent Bogus Creek. Come see them in the hatchery and with videography in the creek and hear about how they are handled with Mark Hampton.

***LIST OF HANDOUTS***

**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING**

***October 22-23, 2003***

***Miner's Inn***

***Yreka, California***

The handouts were provided at the meeting. For copies, please contact Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office, at (530) 842-5763.

Agendum 4	Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Fiscal Year 2004 Funded Projects
Agendum 4	Letter to John Engbring, Chairman Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force from the Bureau of Reclamation regarding the purchase of the Barnes Ranch in the Upper Klamath Basin, dated June 26, 2003
Agendum 4	Letter to Robert Hight, Director California Department of Fish & Game from the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force, regarding Chinook Salmon Yearling Release Program at Iron Gate Hatchery, dated September 10, 2003
Agendum 4	Letter to Secretary Gale Norton from the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force regarding Comments on the Bureau of Reclamation Klamath River Basin Conservation Implementation Program, dated October 17, 2003
Agendum 4	Letter to Secretary Gale Norton from the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force regarding Additional Funding Recommended for Research and Monitoring Studies of Klamath River Anadromous Fisheries, dated October 17, 2003
Agendum 5d	Press Release regarding Herger Releases Statement on Klamath Fishery Management Council, dated June 23, 2003
Agendum 5e	Steelhead and Fall Chinook Angler Harvest Summaries, Lower Klamath River – 2003 Season Preliminary Data from the California Department of Fish and Game
Agendum 5e	Spring-run salmon run-size, spawner escapement and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Junction City Creek Weir from 1977 through 2002, from California Department of Fish and Game
Agendum 5e	Willow Creek and Junction City Weir Trapping Summaries, from California Department of Fish and Game
Agendum 6	Power Point Presentation from Dr. Ken Rykbost of Oregon State

University regarding The Klamath Watershed in Perspective: A review of Historical Hydrology of Major Features of the Klamath River Watershed and Evaluation of Hardy Flow Requirements

- |               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Agendum 6     | Facts Regarding Hardy Phase II, from Mike Belchik, Yurok Tribe                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Agendum 7     | Klamath Forest Alliance comments regarding the Coho Recovery Planning efforts                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Agendum 10    | Letter to Interested parties from the California-Nevada Fish Health Center regarding monitoring of the Chinook salmon in the lower Klamath River and Ishi Pishi fall reach during August and September 2003, dated October 3, 2003                                                                       |
| Agendum 10    | Draft Letter to Dave Sabo, Area Manager of the Bureau of Reclamation, from the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force regarding Supplemental Notice of Intent (SNOI) to Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the operation of the Klamath Project, submitted by the Technical Work Group |
| Agendum 12    | Water quality analysis table provided by Jim Beck                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Agendum 14    | Revision of the Long Range Plan Review of Actions Taken Prior to October 11, 2001, from the Klamath Task Force Subcommittee on Recommendations from the Mid-Term Evaluation                                                                                                                              |
| Agendum 14    | Excerpts taken from the Mid-Term Evaluation and Long Range Plan                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Agendum 16    | Klamath Hydroelectric Project (P-2082) Relicensing Process, John Mudre, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, dated October 23, 2003                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Agendum 17    | Proposal from Dave Bitts regarding Task Force direction to the Technical Work Group to work with the sub-basin coordination groups to generate a list of projects essential to the restoration of anadromous fish in the Klamath Basin and prioritize these projects                                     |
| Agendum 18    | Klamath Hydroelectric Project Draft License Application Selection from Klamath Forest Alliance Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Informational | Task Force Membership List, as of October 16, 2003                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Informational | 2002 Annual Report of the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Informational | The National Academies News regarding Broader Approach Needed for Protection and Recovery of Fish in Klamath River Basin, dated October 22, 2003                                                                                                                                                         |

# KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

*October 22-23, 2003*

*Miner's Inn*

*Yreka, California*

## ***LIST OF ATTENDIES***

The following individuals attended the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force meeting in Yreka, California on the dates indicated:

### **October 22, 2003**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Ken Rykhost	Oregon State University
John Mudre	FERC
Paul Kirk	Klamath Coalition
Frankie Green	FERC
Scott Quinn	Karuk Tribe
Jim Henderson	Mid-Klamath Watershed Council
Alice Kilham	Klamath Compact Commission
Doug Burch	California Department of Fish & Game
Petey Brucker	Technical Work Group
Jim Carpenter	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
Bill Bennett	California Department of Water Resource
Jacqui Krizo	Public
Rick Kruger	Oregon Department Fish & Wildlife
Earl Danosky	Tulelake Irrigation District
Harry Carlson	UC Intermountain Resource Center
Deb Crisp	Tulelake Growers Association
Marty Macy	Public
Tam Moore	Capital Press
Mike Dammarell	Public
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Association
John Menke	Public
Felice Pace	Klamath Forest Alliance
Steve Orloff	Cooperative Extension
Mike Belchik	Yurok Tribe
Matt St. John	North Coast Water Quality Control Board
John Hamilton	Yreka Fish & Wildlife Service
Craig Martz	California Department of Fish & Game
Christine Karas	Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Falls
Jeff Bray	Public
Richard Christie	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
Rhonda Muse	Scott River Watershed Council
Curt Mullis	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Jim DePree	Siskiyou County
Frank Watkins	Public

Rick Meredith  
 Jim Beck  
 Kehn Gibson  
 Roberta Van de Water

Discovery High School  
 Public  
 Tri-County Courier  
 U.S. Forest Service

**October 23, 2003**

Name

Organization

Rick Meredith	Discovery High School
Petey Brucker	Technical Work Group
Christine Karas	Bureau of Reclamation
Curt Mullis	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
David Webb	Great Northern Corporation
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Association
Jim Henderson	Mid-Klamath Watershed Council
John Mudre	FERC
Rick Kruger	Oregon Fish & Wildlife Service
Frankie Green	FERC
Matt St. John	North Coast Water Quality Control Board
Felice Pace	Klamath Forest Alliance
Jim DePree	Siskiyou County

## **KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING**

*October 22-23, 2003*

*Miner's Inn*

*Yreka, California*

### ***MOTIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS***

#### **Motions:**

##### **Agendum 3**

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the amended agenda.

Seconded by Jill Geist.

Motion passed unanimously.

##### **Agendum 5**

Steve West moved, for this meeting only, to identify the authors and affiliations of all handouts submitted to the Task Force. This information should be included in the formal record.

Seconded by Marcia Armstrong.

Motion passed unanimously.

##### **Agendum 14**

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the revisions made to the Long-Range Plan shown in Agendum 14 handout and agreed to in this meeting, with the sole exclusion of section 2.F.4. The Task Force will not adopt the Long-Range plan structure recommended by Kier & Associates.

Seconded by Chuck Blackburn.

Motion passed unanimously.

#### **Assignments:**

##### **Agendum 5**

Steve West asked that the Task Force consider as formal policy during the next meeting a requirement that all handouts must include date, authorship, and capacity in which the document is being submitted (affiliation).

##### **Agendum 7**

Staff will invite Oregon Department of Water Resources to the February Task Force meeting to address concerns regarding water appropriation.

##### **Agendum 10**

Task Force members will provide comments to staff within two weeks regarding Technical Work Group comment letter on the Bureau of Reclamation's EIS scoping document. Staff will work with Petey Brucker to incorporate Task Force feedback into the comment letter for submission to the Bureau of Reclamation by December 15, 2003.

Staff will distribute an electronic version of the Technical Work Group EIS comments to Task Force members.

**Agendum 14**

Staff will include recommendation 2.F.4 of the Long Range Plan on the February Task Force meeting agenda for discussion.

Staff will organize a presentation for the February Task Force meeting on suction dredge mining issues affecting anadromous fish, regulatory controls on it, and methods for addressing cumulative effects. Presenters could include representatives from California Department of Fish and Game, Forest Service, NOAA Fisheries, dredge miners, and Petey Brucker.

Staff will work with Ronnie Pierce to identify the work it will take to update the Long-Range Plan according to Task Force decisions. Staff will coordinate with the Mid-Term Evaluation Sub-committee regarding any questions and send an email to the Task Force describing how we will move forward on this before the February meeting.

Staff will invite NRCS to the February Task Force meeting to give an update on their expanding program, covering both the Upper Basin and Lower Basin activities.

**Agendum 17**

Technical Work Group is assigned to produce a prioritized list of key projects that could be implemented in the near future to benefit anadromous fish of the basin. The document will include cost estimates and potential partners to help with implementation. The Task Force will discuss the list during the February meeting for determination of next steps.